

going to maintain viability for a long time into the future rather than show we just crossed another milestone on our way to the dustbin of history. This is something that is important to our society, to our foundation. Let's love everybody. Let's use law enforcement to stop those like the evil perpetrator in Charleston, like the leftwinger I think it was in North Carolina that killed the Muslims. There is no call for that. The man needs to go to prison. In Texas, we would say it is a multiple murder. I would say you need to get the death penalty for killing more than one Muslim. There is no place for that.

But again, when it comes to the optimum home, a loving mother and father can procreate, adopt, but regardless of who agrees or disagrees, this is going to be a civilization changer, and it is not going to be for the better. We are going to continue our divisiveness and destructiveness when the highest Court in the land has Justices that say: My opinion is so much more important than the Bible, Moses, Jesus. My opinion is so much more valuable that I am going to violate the law; I am going to break the law so I can sit on this opinion, so the country can have my forced opinion on it.

I know there are Christian leaders, some are ready to capitulate, but there are some that won't. But we are now to the point, STEVE KING and I and some others, addressed back when the hate crime bill was being discussed, that we are going to lead to the point where you ultimately persecute, eventually prosecute people because of their beliefs about sexuality. People then were wrong because they couldn't see the future, but this is where we have come.

Now, if you hold the same beliefs that David Axelrod says the President didn't, but he said it in order to get elected, that a marriage is a man and a woman, you hold that belief that most Americans have held and still hold, that the Founders all held regardless of their sexuality, they believed a family, marriage at least, was a man and a woman, that that was foundational.

So I am not sure what is going to happen in this country. I don't have that kind of crystal ball. But I know if we have two or three Justices who are clearly disqualified, who have clearly indicated—not only raised questions as to whether they could be reasonably questioned as to their impartiality, they made clear they are very, very partial. I don't know what happens, but it isn't going to be good at all.

Justice Sotomayor has made statements that indicate she has an opinion before this case was decided. So, Mr. Speaker, I hope scholars will look carefully at this and they will understand, if Supreme Court Justices violate the law in order to change the law dramatically, as they want to do, is that a valid law? I don't believe it is. If they break the law in order to make the law, it is a void law. They need to recuse themselves and let an impartial group on the Court make the decision. It should be left to the States anyway.

It is probably sufficient grounds for impeachment for a Supreme Court Justice to violate the law so that they can force their will upon the American people to push through their legislative agenda even though they are not legislators. Probably impeachment would be in order. If they break the law in order to change dramatically the law, they shouldn't be on the Supreme Court.

It is my hope and prayer they will do the legal thing, recuse themselves before the Court makes its final decision with regard to marriage. If they don't, they will go down in legitimate American history books as being exceedingly destructive, and history will note that they violated the law in order to change the law so that it would be the way they wanted, not with a constitutional amendment, not through a legislative process, not by a constitutional convention that article V provides for. They just had the feeling that they wanted to tinker with over 200 years of law and foundational societal structure and force America to abide by their legislative agenda. Again, I just can't get over that.

If they don't disqualify themselves, they will violate the law to try to change the law with the agenda they have made clear that they have. So, Mr. Speaker, I hope Americans will join me in not only hoping, but praying that their hearts will be touched, that they will decide not to act illegally, that they will be moved toward acting lawfully, disqualify themselves, and let us get a proper opinion from the Supreme Court.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of family medical reasons.

Mr. JOLLY (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a family emergency.

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in district.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 19, 2015, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1863. A letter from the Secretary, Office of the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Com-

mission's final rule — Proceedings before the Commodity Futures Trading Commission; Rules Relating to Suspension or Disbarment from Appearance and Practice (RIN: 3038-AE21) received June 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1864. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Grapes Grown in a Designated Area of Southeastern California; Increased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0106; FV15-925-2 FR] received June 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1865. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing ten officers on the enclosed list to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral or rear admiral (lower half), as indicated, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1866. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Bruce E. Grooms, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1867. A letter from the Deputy Director, ODRM, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Removal of Obsolete Provisions received June 17, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1868. A letter from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1869. A letter from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1870. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1871. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1872. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Designation of National Security Positions in the Competitive Service, and Related Matters (RIN: 3206-AM73) received June 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 2390. A bill to require a review of university-based centers for homeland security, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-168, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.